Remarks:

The following remarks are numbered to correspond with the item numbers the Examiner has used in his Office Action of 13 December 2005.

6: Claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 22, and 23 are objected to based on Applicant's reference to "said macro function" in the final claim limitation. These claims are amended accordingly by this paper.

7: Claims 22 and 23 stand rejected based on insufficient antecedent for "said system." These claims are amended accordingly by this paper.

9: Claim 23 stands rejected as non-statutory subject matter. Claim 23 is amended by this paper accordingly, using the suggestion provided by the Examiner. Applicant sincerely thanks the Examiner for his suggestion.

11: The Examiner has rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Hansen. Claim 5 is amended by this paper to point out the Applicant's invention more distinctly, by including the limitation "said shadow property being identified by an input property token." Support for this teaching appears on page 32 of Applicant's specification. This teaching is believed to be absent from Hansen.

13: The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Hansen and Eidahl. Claim 1 is amended by this paper to point out the Applicant's invention more distinctly, by including the limitation "said shadow property being identified by an input property token." Support for this teaching appears on page 32 of Applicant's specification. This teaching is believed to be absent from the aforementioned references used to support the Examiner's rejection.

14 - 15: Claims 2-4 depend upon Claim 1, and include the limitations of Claim 1. As explained above, Claim 1 is amended by this paper, and is believed to be allowable, and therefore also Claims 2-4.

16 - 17: Claims 6 and 8 depend upon Claim 5, and include the limitations of Claim 5. As explained above, Claim 5 is amended by this paper, and is believed to be allowable, and therefore also Claims 6 and 8.

18 - 19: Claims 9, 10, and 12 are canceled by this paper.

20: Claims 14 and 16 are canceled by this paper.

21-22: The Examiner has rejected Claims 17, 19, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Hansen in view of Chiles. Claims 17, 19, 22, and 23 are amended by this paper to point out the Applicant's invention more distinctly, by including the limitation "said shadow property being identified by an input property token." Support for this teaching appears on page

32 of Applicant's specification. This teaching is believed to be absent from the aforementioned references used to support the Examiner's rejection.

Conclusion: Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 22, and 23 are pending. This paper cancels Claims 9, 10, 12, 14, and 16. Independent Claims 1, 5, 17, 19, 22, and 23 are amended as explained above, and are believed to be ready for allowance, and therefore also dependent claims 2-4, 6, and 8. Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to allow Claims 1-6, 8, 17, 19, 22, and 23, and requests that the application now pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

By: David R. Irvin

David R. Irvin

Reg. No. 42,682